

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Leo McClam,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 3:14-cv-03240-TLW
	)	
Officer Otis Daniels; Dr. NFN Cross;	)	
Judy Dupree, social worker;	)	
Lori Avent, Sheriff; Ms. Monique	)	
NLN, South Carolina Dept. of Mental	)	
Health; and Kenney Boone, Florence	)	
County Sheriff, in their own private,	)	
individual, and personal capacities,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Leo McClam, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action on August 13, 2014, alleging lack of dignity and respect, unprofessionalism on the job, false arrest, and false detainment against six defendants who appear to be law enforcement officials or employees of the South Carolina Department of Mental Health. (Doc. #1). The same day, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting that this Court issue an order removing his picture and identification as a sex offender from the internet. (Doc. #3).

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court dismiss the case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process and deny Plaintiff’s motion for an order of removal.

(Doc. #9). Objections to the Report were due on September 8, 2014. Plaintiff filed no objections.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report in accordance with this standard, and it concludes that the Magistrate Judge accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #9). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, this case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Additionally, because both the United States Supreme Court and the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals have upheld the requirement that states make public the contents of their sex offender registries, see, e.g., United States v. Under Seal, 709 F.3d 257 (4th Cir. 2013), Plaintiff's motion for an order removing his picture and identification as a sex offender from the internet is **DENIED**. (Doc. #3).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*  
Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

October 21, 2014  
Columbia, South Carolina